



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,739	06/22/2001	David S. Singer	[Y0R9-2000-0564US1]	7487
7590	01/26/2005		EXAMINER	
Kenneth A Seaman 219 Glen Oaks Road Charlotte, NC 28270				LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2161		

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/887,739	SINGER ET AL.	
	Examiner Etienne P LeRoux	Art Unit 2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 14-27 and 39-56 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 14-27 and 39-56 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 June 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

Continued Examination

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 4, 2004, has been entered.

Claim Status

Claims 14-27 and 39-56 are pending. Claims 1-13 and 28-38 have been cancelled. Claims 14-27 and 39-56 are rejected as detailed below.

Claim Objections

Claims 14 and 52 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 14 recites "a system which compares the words with a dictionary to identify words which do not appear in the dictionary." Furthermore, claim 14 includes "a system which receives a user input indicating whether a web site should be associated with a word or phrase." It is not clear which words are associated with a web site, i.e., words which do not appear in the dictionary or other words or all of the above. For purposes of this Office Action, examiner assumes that words not appearing in the dictionary are linked to a web site because the specification includes linking words such as trademarks, company names and company copyright

words which are not likely to appear in a common dictionary. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 14 recites “a system which compares the words with a dictionary to identify words which do not appear in the dictionary.” Examiner suggests above limitation be rewritten as following: “a system which compares the words with a dictionary to identify the words which do not appear in the dictionary.”

Claim 52 recites “if the user has indicated that a web sire should be associated with the text component.” Appropriate spelling correction is required such that “web site” is included in above claim limitation.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01. Instances of embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code appear at least on pages 3, 4, 16 and 17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 50 recites "a system which uses a list of sites for which no web site could be found and using this list in generating the output of web sites for the text." The scope of the invention cannot be determined as it is unclear what comprises a list of sites. It is unclear exactly what kind of site is being claimed because above site is not a web site. Furthermore, the scope of the invention cannot be determined because it is unclear why applicant is producing an output to a web site which does not exist.

Art Rejection Precluded

Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite and is indefinite to the extent that art rejection is precluded.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 14-16 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No 5,634,121 to Tracz et al (hereafter Tracz) in view of US Pat No 6,618,717 to Karadimitriou et al (hereafter Karadimitriou) and further in view of US Pat No 6,496,834 to Getchius et al (hereafter Getchius).

Claim 14:

Tracz discloses a parser which separates text into words and phrases [Fig 2, 31, col 4, lines 16-30]

Tracz discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above but does not disclose a system which compares the words with a dictionary to identify [the] words which do not appear in the dictionary. Karadimitriou discloses a system which compares the words with a dictionary to identify [the] words which do not appear in the dictionary [col 7, lines 10-15]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tracz to include a system which compares the words with a dictionary to identify [the] words which do not appear in the dictionary as taught by Karadimitriou for the purpose of identifying possible candidate names [Karadimitriou, col 6, line 44] and hence identifying the owner of a web site [Karadimitriou, col 6, line 31]. The skilled technician would have been motivated to modify the invention of Tracz per the above such that the owner of a web site can be identified to provide: (1) tagging the content of a web site, (2) estimating the value and accuracy of the information on the web site and (3), using the information from the website according to attributes associated with the source [Karadimitriou, col 3, lines 5-10].

Furthermore, the combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou discloses entries for which a web site is available [Tracz, col 2, lines 10-25, Karadimitriou, col 5, lines 7-21].

Furthermore, the combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou discloses generat[ing] an output display to a user indicating one or more web site(s) associated with one of the words and phrases [Tracz, col 4, lines 3-9].

Furthermore, the combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou discloses a system which receives a user input indicating whether a web site should be associated with a word or phrase and which one or more of the web sites should be associated with the word and phrase [Tracz, col 4, lines 3-9].

Furthermore, the combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou discloses an editing system [Tracz, col 2, lines 9-13] which includes a hotlink for the web site(s) indicated by the user input if the user has indicated that a web site should be associated with the word and phrase [Tracz, col 4, lines 3-10].

The combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou discloses the elements of claim 14 as noted above except for generating a web site for the text. Getchius discloses generating a web site for the text [Fig 6 and col 10, lines 42-46]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou to include generating a web site for the text as taught by Getchius for the purpose of enhancing a business listing [col 10, lines 42-46]. The skilled technician would have been motivated to improve the combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou per the above such that a user is able to provide additional business information by generating a new web site and then linking the new

web site to a pre-existing web site thereby facilitating navigation of the World Wide Web by making it convenient for a web surfer to quickly access relevant information.

Claim 15:

The combination of Tracz, Karadimitriou and Getchius discloses the elements of claim 14 as noted above and furthermore, discloses wherein the system which compares the words and phrases includes a web search engine [Tracz, col 2, line 24]

Claim 16:

The combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou and Getchius discloses the elements of claim 14 as noted above and furthermore, discloses wherein the system which compares the words and phrases includes a dictionary, where the comparison includes variations of the words [Tracz, col 4, lines 20-23].

Claim 19:

The combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou and Getchius discloses the elements of claim 14 as noted above, however, regarding claim 19, Tracz does not disclose wherein the system which compares words and phrases includes a system which identifies a corporate name in the text as an indicator of an associated web site. Karadimitriou discloses wherein the system which compares words and phrases includes a system which identifies a corporate name in the text as an indicator of an associated web site [Karadimitriou, col 6, lines 31-55]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tracz to include wherein the system which compares words and phrases includes a system which identifies a corporate name in the text as an indicator of an associated web site as taught by Karadimitriou for the purpose of identifying the owner of a web site [Karadimitriou, col 6, line

31]. The skilled technician would have been motivated to modify the invention of Tracz per the above such that the owner of a web site can be identified to provide: (1) tagging the content of a web site, (2) estimating the value and accuracy of the information on the web site and (3), using the information from the website according to attributes associated with the source [Karadimitriou, col 3, lines 5-10].

Claim 20:

The combination of Tracz, Karadimitriou and Getchius discloses the elements of claim 14 as noted above, however, regarding claim 20, Tracz does not disclose wherein the system which compares words and phrases includes a mechanism which recognizes capitalization as an indicator of a word possibly associated with a web site. Karadimitriou discloses wherein the system which compares words and phrases includes a mechanism which recognizes capitalization as an indicator of a word possibly associated with a web site [Karadimitriou, col 6, lines 31-55]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tracz to include wherein the system which compares words and phrases includes a mechanism which recognizes capitalization as an indicator of a word possibly associated with a web site as taught by Karadimitriou for the purpose of identifying the owner of a web site [Karadimitriou, col 6, line 31]. The skilled technician would have been motivated to modify the invention of Tracz per the above such that the owner of a web site can be identified to provide: (1) tagging the content of a web site, (2) estimating the value and accuracy of the information on the web site and (3), using the information from the website according to attributes associated with the source [Karadimitriou, col 3, lines 5-10].

Claim 21:

The combination of Tracz, Karadimitriou and Getchius discloses the elements of claims 14 and 20 as noted above, however, regarding claim 21, Tracz does not disclose wherein the mechanism which recognizes capitalization as an indicator includes a component which identifies capitalization which occurs within a word as an indicator. Karadimitriou discloses wherein the mechanism which recognizes capitalization as an indicator includes a component which identifies capitalization which occurs within a word as an indicator [Karadimitriou, col 6, lines 31-55]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tracz to include wherein the mechanism which recognizes capitalization as an indicator includes a component which identifies capitalization which occurs within a word as an indicator as taught by Karadimitriou for the purpose of identifying the owner of a web site [Karadimitriou, col 6, line 31]. The skilled technician would have been motivated to modify the invention of Tracz per the above such that the owner of a web site can be identified to provide: (1) tagging the content of a web site, (2) estimating the value and accuracy of the information on the web site and (3), using the information from the website according to attributes associated with the source [Karadimitriou, col 3, lines 5-10].

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou and Getchius and further in view of US Pat No 6,606,597 issued to Ringger et al (hereafter Ringger).

Claim 17:

The combination of Tracz, Karadimitriou and Getchius discloses the elements of claim 14 as noted above except for wherein the system which compares the words and phrases includes

Art Unit: 2161

a dictionary which is augmented by rules which identify other related words which are considered a part of the dictionary. Ringger discloses wherein the system which compares the words and phrases includes a dictionary which is augmented by rules which identify other related words which are considered a part of the dictionary [col 10, lines 50-67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Tracz, Karadimitriou and Getchius to include wherein the system which compares the words and phrases includes a dictionary which is augmented by rules which identify other related words which are considered a part of the dictionary as taught by Ringger for the purpose of including lexical information about the word by means of a tag [col 10, lines 50-58]. The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou and Getchius per the above such that an augmented vocabulary can be produced for developing a language model [col 10, lines 50-55].

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Tracz, Karadimitriou and Getchius and further in view of Pub No 2002/0010682 issued to Johnson (hereafter Johnson).

Claim 18:

The combination of Tracz, Karadimitriou and Getchius discloses the elements of claim 14 as noted above except for wherein the system which compares words and phrases includes a system which recognizes indications contained in the test of a trademark as an indicator of an associated web. Johnson discloses wherein the system which compares words and phrases includes a system which recognizes indications contained in the test of a trademark as an

indicator of an associated web [paragraph 36]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Tracz, Karadimitriou and Getchius to include wherein the system which compares words and phrases includes a system which recognizes indications contained in the test of a trademark as an indicator of an associated web as taught by Johnson for the purpose of determining work of authorship [paragraph 36]. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the combination of Tracz, Karadimitriou and Getchius per the above such that users of intellectual property can be identified [paragraph 36].

Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Tracz, Karadimitriou and Getchius and further in view of US Pat No 6,065,059 to Shieh et al (hereafter Shieh) and still further in view of US Pat No 6,629,135 to Ross et al (hereafter Ross).

Claim 51:

The combination of Tracz, Karadimitriou and Getchius discloses the elements of claim 14 as noted above but does not disclose wherein the system which compares includes a “no links” list and the output is based on the “no links” list. Shieh discloses a “no links” list and the output is based on the “no links” list [Fig 3, step 30, col 3, lines 47-55]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Tracz, Karadimitriou and Getchius to include a “no links” list and basing the output on the “no links” list as taught by Shieh for the purpose of restricting access to certain sites. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the combination of Tracz and

Karadimitriou and Getchius per the above such that children are prevented from visiting pornographic web sites [col 3, lines 47-55].

The combination of Tracz, Karadimitriou, Getchius and Shieh discloses the above elements of the invention but does not disclose a “past links” list and the output is based on the “past links” list. Ross discloses a “past links” list and the output is based on the “past links” list [col 14, lines 13-35]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Tracz, Karadimitriou and Getchius and Shieh to include a “past links” list and the output is based on the “past links” list as taught by Ross for the purpose of reviewing past links such that a user is provided with a convenient means of editing past links.

Claims 22-24, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson and further in view of the combination of Karadimitriou, Tracz and Getchius.

Claim 22:

Johnson discloses a program component which identifies a portion of the text for which a web site may exist [paragraph 36].

Johnson discloses the above element(s) of the invention except for a program component which compares the portion of the text to a dictionary to determine that a dictionary entry for the portion does not exist. Karadimitriou discloses a program component which compares the portion of the text to a dictionary to determine that a dictionary entry for the portion does not exist [col 7, lines 10-15]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Johnson to include a program component which

compares the portion of the text to a dictionary to determine that a dictionary entry for the portion does not exist as taught by Karadimitriou for the purpose of identifying a legal entity (individual or institution, company or organization) which owns a web site [col 5, lines 5-10]. The skilled technician would have been motivated to improve the invention of Johnson per the above such that the owner of a web site can be automatically identified to provide a means for tagging the information according to its source, to filter it and estimate its accuracy [col 3, lines 5-10].

The combination of Johnson and Karadimitriou discloses the above elements of the invention except for a program component which displays to a user for user input the one or more located web sites which are associated with an identified portion of the text. Tracz discloses a program component which displays to a user for user input the one or more located web sites which are associated with an identified portion of the text [col 4, lines 3-9]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Johnson and Karadimitriou to include a program component which displays to a user for user input the one or more located web sites which are associated with an identified portion of the text as taught by Tracz for the purpose of providing a user the means of deciding whether to provide a link [col 4, lines 25-30]. The skilled technician would have been motivated to improve the combination of Johnson and Karadimitriou per the above such that links need not be provided to words that do not require dictionary linking [col 2, lines 9-21].

Furthermore, the combination of Johnson, Karadimitriou and Tracz discloses a program component which responds to a user input to select whether to include a web site and, if more

than one site is identified, to select which web site or web sites will be included [Tracz, col 4, lines 3-9].

Furthermore, the combination of Johnson, Karadimitriou and Tracz discloses a program component which creates a hot link to the one or more web sites which were selected by the user [Tracz, col 4, lines 3-10].

The combination of Johnson, Karadimitriou and Tracz discloses above elements of the invention except for a program component which creates a web site based on the text. Getchius discloses a program component which creates a web site based on the text [Fig 14, col 10, lines 42-46]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Johnson, Karadimitriou and Tracz to include a program component which creates a web site based on the text as taught by Getchius for the purpose of enhancing a business listing [col 10, lines 42-46]. The skilled technician would have been motivated to improve the combination of Johnson, Karadimitriou and Tracz per the above to provide additional business information by generating a new website and then linking the new web site to a pre-existing web site thereby facilitating navigation of the World Wide Web by making it convenient for a web surfer to quickly access relevant information.

Claim 23:

The combination of Johnson, Karadimitriou, Tracz and Getchius discloses the elements of claim 22 as noted above, however, regarding claim 23, Johnson does not disclose a dictionary which is associated with the program component which identifies a portion of text for which a web site may exist. Karadimitriou discloses a dictionary which is associated with the program component which identifies a portion of text for which a web site may exist [Karadimitriou, col

7, lines 10-15]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Johnson to include a dictionary which is associated with the program component which identifies a portion of text for which a web site may exist as taught by Karadimitriou for the purpose of identifying possible candidate names [Karadimitriou, col 6, line 44] and hence identifying the owner of a web site [Karadimitriou, col 6, line 31]. The skilled technician would have been motivated to modify the invention of Johnson per the above such that the owner of a web site can be identified to provide: (1) tagging the content of a web site, (2) estimating the value and accuracy of the information on the web site and (3), using the information from the website according to attributes associated with the source [Karadimitriou, col 3, lines 5-10].

Claim 24:

The combination of Johnson, Karadimitriou, Tracz and Getchius discloses the elements of claim 22 as noted above, however, regarding claim 24, Johnson does not disclose a system which recognizes capital letters in a word as an indicator of words with which web sites may be associated. Karadimitriou discloses a system which recognizes capital letters in a word as an indicator of words with which web sites may be associated [Karadimitriou, col 6, lines 31-55]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Johnson to include a system which recognizes capital letters in a word as an indicator of words with which web sites may be associated as taught by Karadimitriou for the purpose of identifying the owner of a web site [Karadimitriou, col 6, line 31]. The skilled technician would have been motivated to modify the invention of Tracz per the above such that the owner of a web site can be identified to provide: (1) tagging the content of a web site, (2) estimating the value

and accuracy of the information on the web site and (3), using the information from the website according to attributes associated with the source [Karadimitriou, col 3, lines 5-10].

Claim 26:

The combination of Johnson, Karadimitriou, Tracz and Getchius discloses the above elements of claim 22 and furthermore discloses wherein the system which identifies words which may be associated with web sites further includes a system which is responsive to identification of trademarks [Johnson, paragraph 36].

Claim 27:

The combination of Johnson, Karadimitriou, Tracz and Getchius discloses the above elements of claim 22 , however, regarding claim 27, Johnson does not disclose wherein the system which identifies words which may be associated with web sites further includes a system which is responsive to identification of corporation names in the text [Karadimitriou, col 6, lines 31-55]. Karadimitriou discloses wherein the system which identifies words which may be associated with web sites further includes a system which is responsive to identification of corporation names in the text [Karadimitriou, col 6, lines 31-55]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Johnson to include wherein the system which identifies words which may be associated with web sites further includes a system which is responsive to identification of corporation names in the text as taught by Karadimitriou for the purpose of identifying the owner of a web site [Karadimitriou, col 6, line 31]. The skilled technician would have been motivated to modify the invention of Tracz per the above such that the owner of a web site can be identified to provide: (1) tagging the content of a web site, (2) estimating the value and accuracy of the information on the web site and (3),

using the information from the website according to attributes associated with the source [Karadimitriou, col 3, lines 5-10].

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Johnson, Karadimitriou, Tracz and Getchius and further in view of Des. 414,471 to Poole et al (hereafter Poole).

Claim 25:

The combination of Johnson, Karadimitriou, Tracz and Getchius discloses the above elements of claims 22 and 24 as noted above but fails to disclose wherein the system which recognizes capital letters is responsive to unusual capitalization as an indication of a word associated with a web site. Poole discloses wherein the system which recognizes capital letters is responsive to unusual capitalization as an indication of a word associated with a web site [iMAC, front page, second column]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Johnson, Karadimitriou, Tracz and Getchius to include wherein the system which recognizes capital letters is responsive to unusual capitalization as an indication of a word associated with a web site as taught by Poole for the purpose of providing a means to uniquely identify a corporate product. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the combination of Johnson, Karadimitriou, Tracz and Getchius per the above for the purpose of facilitating name recognition by a member of the general public.

Claims 39-41 and 45-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tracz in view of Karadimitriou.

Claim 39:

Tracz discloses parsing text to separate it into words and phrases [Tracz, Fig 2, col 4, lines 16-30]. Tracz discloses above elements of the invention but fails to disclose using a dictionary to determine words and phrases for which no dictionary entry is found. Karadimitriou discloses using a dictionary to determine words and phrases for which no dictionary entry is found [col 7, lines 10-15]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tracz to include using a dictionary to determine words and phrases for which no dictionary entry is found as taught by Karadimitriou for the purpose of identifying possible candidate names [col 6, line 44]. The skilled technician would have been motivated to improve the invention of Tracz per the above for the purpose of identifying candidate names such as a company name, i.e., the legal entity that owns a web site [col 5, lines 6-12].

Furthermore, the combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou discloses comparing at least some of the words and phrases with entries for which a web site is available using the words and phrases for which no dictionary entry is found and generating an output to a user indicating one or more web sites associates with at least one of the words and phrases [Karadimitriou, col 7, lines 10-15].

Furthermore, the combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou discloses receiving a user input which indicates whether a web site should be associated with a selected word or phrase and, if more than one web site has been identified, identifying which of the more than one web site

should be associated with the selected word or phrase and editing the text to include a hotlink for the selected word or phrase based on the user input if the user indicates that a web site should be associated with the selected word or phrase [Tracz col 4, lines 3-10]

Claim 40:

The combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou discloses the elements of claim 39 as noted above and furthermore discloses wherein the step of comparing includes the step of using a search engine [Tracz, col 2, line 24]

Claim 41:

The combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou discloses the elements of claim 39 as noted above and furthermore discloses wherein the step of using a dictionary includes the step of considering variations of words in the dictionary [standard suffix truncation, Tracz, col 4, lines 20-23].

Claim 45:

The combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou discloses the elements of claim 39 as noted above, however, regarding claim 45, Tracz does not disclose identifying a corporate name as an indicator of an associated web site. Karadimitriou discloses identifying a corporate name as an indicator of an associated web site [Karadimitriou, col 6, lines 31-55]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tracz to include identifying a corporate name as an indicator of an associated web site as taught by Karadimitriou for the purpose of identifying the owner of a web site [Karadimitriou, col 6, line 31]. The skilled technician would have been motivated to modify the invention of Tracz per the above such that the owner of a web site can be identified to provide: (1) tagging the content of a

web site, (2) estimating the value and accuracy of the information on the web site and (3), using the information from the website according to attributes associated with the source [Karadimitriou, col 3, lines 5-10].

Claim 46:

The combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou discloses the elements of claim 39 as noted above and furthermore discloses the steps of using the corporate name to identify one or more web sites and selecting one of the web sites for inclusion as a hotlink within the web page [Tracz, col 4, lines 15-30].

Claim 47:

The combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou discloses the elements of claim 39 as noted above, however, regarding claim 47, Tracz does not disclose the step of recognizing a capitalized letter in a work as an indicator of a word possibly associated with a web site [Karadimitriou, col 6, lines 31-55]. Karadimitriou discloses the step of recognizing a capitalized letter in a work as an indicator of a word possibly associated with a web site [Karadimitriou, col 6, lines 31-55]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tracz to include the step of recognizing a capitalized letter in a work as an indicator of a word possibly associated with a web site as taught by Karadimitriou for the purpose of identifying the owner of a web site [Karadimitriou, col 6, line 31]. The skilled technician would have been motivated to modify the invention of Tracz per the above such that the owner of a web site can be identified to provide: (1) tagging the content of a web site, (2) estimating the value and accuracy of the information on the web site and (3), using the information from the website according to attributes associated with the source [Karadimitriou, col 3, lines 5-10].

Claim 48:

The combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou discloses the elements of claims 39 and 47 as noted above and furthermore discloses wherein the step of recognizing a capitalized letter is followed by the steps of identifying a web site associated with the word having the capitalized letter and including a hotlink associated with the web site in the web page [Tracz, col 4, lines 16-30].

Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou and further in view of Poole.

Claim 49:

The combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou discloses the above elements of claims 39 and 47 as noted above but fails to disclose wherein the system which recognizes capital letters is responsive to unusual capitalization as an indication of a word associated with a web site. Poole discloses wherein the system which recognizes capital letters is responsive to unusual capitalization as an indication of a word associated with a web site [iMAC, front page, second column]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou to include wherein the system which recognizes capital letters is responsive to unusual capitalization as an indication of a word associated with a web site as taught by Poole for the purpose of providing a means to uniquely identify a corporate product. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou per the above for the purpose of facilitating name recognition by a member of the general public.

Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Tracz, Karadimitriou and further in view of Pub No US 2002/0130891 to Singer (hereafter Singer).

Claim 42:

The combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou discloses the elements of claims 39 and 41 as noted above but does not disclose wherein the step of comparing words and phrases using a dictionary includes the step of identifying other related words which are considered part of the dictionary. Singer discloses wherein the step of comparing words and phrases using a dictionary includes the step of identifying other related words which are considered part of the dictionary [Singer paragraph 40]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou to include the step of comparing words and phrases using a dictionary includes the step of identifying other related words which are considered part of the dictionary as taught by Singer for the purpose of obtaining additional information about a word [paragraph 40]. The skilled technician would have been motivated to improve the combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou per the above such that a thorough investigation can be made by considering similar words in order to obtain a more precise understanding of a particular word under investigation.

Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Tracz, Karadimitriou and Singer and further in view of Shieh.

Claim 54:

The combination of Tracz, Karadimitriou and Singer discloses the elements of claims 39, 41 and 42 as noted above but does not disclose wherein the step of comparing the component with the “no links” list includes the step of excluding the component from further processing to identify a hotlink associated with the component when the component is listed on the “no links” list. Shieh discloses wherein the step of comparing the component with the “no links” list includes the step of excluding the component from further processing to identify a hotlink associated with the component when the component is listed on the “no links” list [Fig 3, col 3, lines 47-55]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou and singer to include a “no links” list and basing the output on the “no links” list as taught by Shieh for the purpose of restricting access to certain sites. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou and Singer per the above such that children are prevented from visiting pornographic web sites [col 3, lines 47-55].

Claim 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou and further in view of Johnson.

Claim 43:

The combination of Tracz, Karadimitriou discloses the elements of claim 39 as noted above but does not disclose wherein the system which identifies words which may be associated

with web sites further includes a system which is responsive to identification of trademarks.

Johnson discloses wherein the system which identifies words which may be associated with web sites further includes a system which is responsive to identification of trademarks [Johnson, paragraph 36]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou to include wherein the system which identifies words which may be associated with web sites further includes a system which is responsive to identification of trademarks as taught by Johnson for the purpose of assisting legal researchers to search the Internet to identify users of intellectual property [paragraph 36]. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the combination of Tracz and Karadimitriou such the legal researcher can defend the intellectual property rights of the owner of the trademark [paragraph 8].

Claim 44:

The combination of Tracz, Karadimitriou and Johnson discloses the elements of claims 39 and 43 as noted above and furthermore wherein the step of recognizing a trademark includes the step of identifying a web site associated with the trademark and including the web site in the web page [Tracz, linking of the web site, col 4, lines 15-30]

Claims 52 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tracz in view of Shieh and further in view of Ross.

Claim 52:

Tracz discloses parsing text to separate it into components including words and phrases [Tracz, Fig 2, 31, col 4, lines 16-30], comparing components from the parsing with a dictionary [Tracz, col 2, lines 10-20].

Tracz discloses the elements of the invention as noted above but does not disclose a “no links” list to determine which components are likely to have at least one web site associated with the component. Shieh discloses a “no links” list. [Fig 3, col 3, line 47-55]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tracz to include a “no links” list to determine which components are likely to have at least one web site associated with the component as taught by Shieh for the purpose of restricting access to specific sites [col 3, lines 47-55]. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the invention of Tracz per the above such that by restricting access to certain sites, children are not able to access pornographic web sites.

The combination of Tracz and Shieh discloses the elements of the invention as noted above but fails to disclose a “past links” list to determine which components are likely to have at least one web site associated with the component. Ross discloses a “past links” list to determine which components are likely to have at least one web site associated with the component [a list of previously generated links, col 14, lines 13-35]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Tracz and Shieh to include a “past links” list to determine which components are likely to have at least

Art Unit: 2161

one web site associated with the component as taught by Shieh for the purpose of identifying all sites to which a user is linked [col 14, lines 13-35]. The skilled technician would have been motivated to improve the combination of Tracz and Shieh per the above for the purpose of identifying all merchants with which the merchant has a relationship.

Furthermore, the combination of Tracz, Shieh and Ross discloses receiving a user input which indicates whether a web site should be associated with the text component and, if more than one web site has been identified, identifying which of the more than one web site should be identified with the selected word or phrase [Tracz, col 4, lines 3-9]

Furthermore, the combination of Tracz, Shieh and Ross discloses editing [Tracz, col 2, lines 9-13] the web page to include a hotlink for the selected word or phrase based on the user input if the user has indicated that a web site should be associated with the text component [Tracz, col 4, lines 3-10]

Claim 55:

The combination of Tracz Shieh and Ross discloses wherein the step of comparing the component with the “past links” list includes the step of including the associated past link with the component based on the user input [Tracz, col 4, lines 15-30].

Claims 53 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Tracz, Shieh and Ross and further in view of Karadimitriou

Claim 53:

The combination of Tracz, Shieh and Ross discloses the elements of claim 52 as noted above but does not disclose wherein the step of comparing with the dictionary includes the step

of excluding common words which appear in the dictionary. Karadimitriou discloses wherein the step of comparing with the dictionary includes the step of excluding common words which appear in the dictionary [Karadimitriou, col 7, lines 10-15]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Tracz, Shieh and Ross to include regarding a system which compares the words with a dictionary to identify [the] words which do not appear in the dictionary as taught by Karadimitriou for the purpose of identifying possible candidate names [col 6, line 44]. The skilled technician would have been motivated to improve the combination of Tracz, Shieh and Ross per the above for the purpose of identifying candidate names such as a company name, i.e., the legal entity that owns a web site [col 5, lines 6-12].

Claim 56:

The combination of Tracz, Shieh and Ross discloses the elements of claim 52 as noted above but does not disclose wherein the step of comparing the component with the dictionary includes the step of comparing variations of the component with the dictionary and determining if the component does not exist in the dictionary. Karadimitriou discloses the step of comparing the component with the dictionary includes the step of comparing variations of the component with the dictionary and determining if the component does not exist in the dictionary [col 7, lines 10-15]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Tracz, Shieh and Ross to include regarding a system which compares the words with a dictionary to identify [the] words which do not appear in the dictionary as taught by Karadimitriou for the purpose of identifying possible candidate names [col 6, line 44]. The skilled technician would have been motivated to improve the combination

of Tracz, Shieh and Ross per the above for the purpose of identifying candidate names such as a company name, i.e., the legal entity that owns a web site [col 5, lines 6-12].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/04/2004 with respect to claims 14-27 and 39-56 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne LeRoux whose telephone number is (571) 272-4022. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (571) 272-4023.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Patent related correspondence can be forwarded via the following FAX number (703) 872-9306

Etienne LeRoux

January 18, 2005

